Catholic Expansion — Standard
Dec 2/53.

Parson Brownlow's
villainous recommendation
of torturing a slave —
Standard, Sept 23/54.

Southern Aid Soc'y — 1st Annio:
Stand, Nov. 11/54.

"Liberia as it is," — See
Stand. Dec. 2./54.

Slavery in M.E. Church — North
See, Art. in Zion's Herald — copied
Stand. May April 14/55
also — Tribune of Friday, May 9./56

Slavery Stan

—Without Compromise.

RDAY, JUNE 11, 1853.

slaveholding? If the powers conferred upon the general government are now pro-slavery, the mere fact of slaves being counted as a basis of representation, however impolitic, involved no guarantee of Slavery itself.

But where was the proof, in the Constitution, that this three-fifths representation was a representation of slaves? There was no evidence of this to be derived from the words of the instrument; the only evidence lay in an indirect implication. It was just so in regard to what was called the Fugitive Slave Clause. Notwithstanding that he might be willing to admit that slaves were intended to be implied in the phrase 'other persons,' still, if the objects of the confederacy were strictly defined, and no sanction was given to Slavery, then they would certainly grant that it was no sacrifice of principle to accept it. Such was the fact.

The Fugitive Slave Clause was not a power conferred upon the General Government. As all the leading Free Soilers had expressly contended, it was a compact between the people of the States who entered into the Union. If there was any obligation to give up fugitives, it rested solely with the States themselves. The courts had made their decisions upon it, but we were not bound to execute any decision which conflicted with the higher law of God. If there were any clauses in the Constitution which conflicted with the straight-forward principles of right, we were bound to set them aside, and regard them as the idle wind. In the vigorous language of a noble New England poet (J. R. LOWELL), whose words were familiar to thousands who live on the broad praires and along the mighty river of the West—

> 'Though we break our fathers' promise, we have nobler duties first,
> The traitor to Humanity is the traitor most accursed;
> Man is more than constitutions; better rot beneath the sod,
> Than be true to Church and State, while we are doubly false to God'

In saying this, he believed he spoke the sentiments of Free Soilers generally. When they had succeeded in repealing the Fugitive Slave Law, and secured the right interpretation, he did not believe that it would be possible to prove, to the satisfaction of twelve Northern men, that any slave claimant had a right to his so-called property. It was because the South knew this, that they were so unwilling to yield the usurped power they had conferred upon the Federal Government.

In relation to the bugbear of the power of the Union being pledged to put down slave insurrections, he had only to quote the opinion of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, that the carrying out of the clause in reference to this subject would result in the emancipation of the slaves, since the local law would in such case be superseded by martial law, and the master could give no evidence to prove his claim to hold property in his fellow-being. Now, he would ask them candidly to consider the results of giving up their jurisdiction in this matter. They tied themselves hand and foot, and gave themselves over to the enemy. It had been justly said, that Mr. GARRISON was not so much feared at the South as some Free Soil men. If he could sit down with a dozen Georgia slaveholders, or any other Southern men, and explain to them that these Abolitionists would not raise up their hands to strike out the law which provides for returning fugitive slaves, they would not give five dimes for Mr. GARRISON'S head. For his part, he felt like exercising all his rights against the atrocious system. He had been to the South; he had friends there; and the more he saw of the infernal system, the more fully was he convinced to refute them. Whether the Constitution is An Slavery or not; whether it goes for slave-catching not; whether it grants the right of slave represe tation or not; all these things are done under and have been sanctioned, without a note of remo strance, as a matter of course, ever since the forma tion of the government. Now he would appeal t the civilized world, if there was ever a more glarin absurdity than to attempt, in the face of our nation history, in view of the injustice of this countr toward the coloured race for two hundred years, t persuade the people that they have totally misunder stood the matter, and what they had supposed to b black, was altogether white? Did not Washingto and Jefferson, and Patrick Henry, and John Ma shall, and their contemporaries, understand th Constitution? Yet they held but one opinion abou it. Reference had been made to the opinion expresse by John Quincy Adams, to the effect that, in case great national exigency should occur—a formidabl invasion from abroad, for example—Congress woul be justified in abolishing Slavery, under the wa power, as a measure of national self-preservation But this was clearly an exceptional case, and di not affect the question under consideration. Wha Mr. Adams thought of the Constitution itself, in it relation to Slavery and the slave trade, he has tol the world in very explicit language—as follows:

> *'It cannot be denied*—THE SLAVEHOLDING LORDS OF THE SOUTH prescribed, AS A CONDITION OF THEIR ASSENT TO THE CONSTITUTION, *three special provisions* TO SE CURE THE PERPETUITY OF THEIR DOMINION OVER THEIR SLAVES. The first was the immunity, for twenty years, o preserving the African slave trade; the second was the stipu lation to surrender fugitive slaves—an engagement positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai; and thirdly, the exaction, fatal to the principles of popular repre sentation, of a representation for slaves—for articles of mer chandise, under the name of persons. . . . To call go vernment thus constituted a democracy, is to insult the un derstanding of mankind. It is dealing tainted with the infection of riches and Slavery. Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation is to establish an artifical majority in the slave representation over that of the free people, in the American Congress; AND THEREBY TO MAKE THE PRESERVATION, PROPAGATION AND PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY THE VITAL AND ANIMATING SPIRIT OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.'

Did John Quincy Adams understand his country's Constitution? Were his allegations entirely destitute of truth? Why, there was not a Court in the country which did not recognise the pro-slavery character of that instrument; there was not a legislative body which did not recognise it; Congress had uniformly done so; and also the National Executive and the Supreme Court. The people had always regarded it in the same light, and the people could not be mistaken, because it was the embodiment of their will. He (Mr. G.) deemed it inexcusable to attempt to whitewash the character of the framers of the Constitution, by representing that they intended to give no sanction to Slavery, and declaring that they were the friends of impartial liberty. Such a statement was against all the facts of their lives. Why not seek to whitewash the character of the men who passed the Fugitive Slave Law? *The Fugitive Slave Law!* Had not the passage of that Law convulsed the whole country? Was not all Europe filled with horror in view of it? But, according to the logic of his friend from Ohio, no such Law has ever been enacted by Congress, or attempted to be enforced by the government! All this prodigious excitement—this world-wide feeling of moral indignation—was the result of gross misapprehension! He called upon his friend from Ohio to show that the Law, so universally execrated, contained one single sentence or word which authorized slave-hunting or slave-catching, or required the surrender of fugitive slaves! It referred solely to 'persons held to service or labour'—using the exact language of the American Constitution. Now if the words 'persons held to service or labour,' in the Constitution, cannot, do not, and were never intended to apply to fugitive slaves (and this is the ground assumed by those who maintain the Anti-Slavery character of that instrument), then it is just as certain that they can have no such meaning or application in what is called the Fugitive Slave Law. But is it would be to outrage the intelligence of the country to deny that the express design of that Law was the seizure of fugitive slaves, and the punishment of such persons as sought to secrete them, so is equally preposterous to assert that the Constitution contains no compromises on the subject of slavery.

When did the white people of this country ever exhibit any feelings of compassion, any friendliness or spirit, for the coloured population? For two centuries, they had outraged them in every way, and trodden them like ashes under their feet! When had it been possible for them, intelligently and purposely, to adopt a Constitution, embracing on equal terms with themselves, those whom they had thus cruelly despised and systematically prescribed? Never!

This conflict with the Slave Power was not simply a matter of verbal criticism, but it had reference to the overshadowing and an all-controlling system of oppression, which was to be met and vanquished by something more potent than an ingenious play upon words. We have been challenged to prove that the word SLAVE is in the Constitution—that it contains anything adverse to human liberty. It is true that such word is found in the instrument; neither did it ever contain the words 'foreign slave trade,' yet, for twenty years after its adoption, that trade was prosecuted under the American flag, as a legitimate branch of the commerce of the country—*as a constitutional right*. It is equally certain that, in their treatment of the coloured people, our fathers were guilty of great injustice, before God. They would not take the black man into their embrace; they would not recognise his manhood; and to this hour he is treated more like a leper than an American citizen.

So, then, it was not true that our fathers made an Anti-Slavery Constitution. In their state of mind, was it morally impossible for them to do so. It was their intention to do any such thing. Doubtless, it was a very easy thing, on that platform, for his friend from Ohio to make the Constitution all Anti-Slavery; but what would the South make of it? *And with his interpretation of it, where was the Union?* Did they suppose that the South meant to submit to such a criticism as that—meant to yield to an Anti-Slavery interpretation of the very instrument they had fashioned themselves, and which was shaped directly to their own liking? It was the acme of absurdity!

As for the remark of his friend, that the South referred the action of the old organization to that of the Free Soilers, was it so? It was a novel piece of intelligence. If the South did not understand his position, and that of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in regard to the Union and to voting, it was because they had not tried to make it plain. The truth was, the old organization was the only one which Southern slaveholders respected, because it clearly understood the issue presented to them, and flexibly and uncompromisingly. But, as for this attempt to get round the bargain, this quibbling—in other words, the South held it to be equally despicable and dishonest; and they would regard such misinterpretation as a virtual declaration of war, if enforcement were attempted. They would feel themselves justified in rising up as one man, and spilling the last drop of blood in their veins, to prevent the carrying out of this interpretation. Our friends did agree to sustain Slavery; the people voted to it; and the instrument remains as it was originally, in regard to its pro-slavery compromises. And those who acted with him, acknowledged this, and would not attempt to cloak it; therefore they could not consent to be members of a government that upheld it, and required acquiescence and participation in it. Therefore it was that they washed their hands of it, and stood outside before God and innocency, crying in the ear of the world, *'No Union with Slaveholders, religiously or politically?'* (great cheering)

Mr. JOHN T. HILTON defended the course and action of the old-organized Anti-Slavery Society, which had the coloured race (to which he belonged) had always recognised Mr. Garrison and his associates as their true and clear-sighted friends. He thanked God for preserving this Society, for preserving and prolonging the life of Mr. Garrison, and for enabling him to speak in fitting terms of the corruptions and iniquities of the slaveholders.

Adjourned.

Selections.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN UNION.

At the half-yearly meeting of this Association, held at Cheltenham (England), on Wednesday, May 4th, John B. Estlin, Esq., of Bristol, moved the following resolution: 1853.

"That, at the present period of unexampled interest throughout the civilized world on the important subject of American Slavery, this meeting considers that Unitarian Christians are called upon by their principles and position as a religious body to respond to the solemn appeal of the 'British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,' and earnestly hopes that at the approaching anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, a faithful and Christian course may be addressed to our brethren of a common faith in America, affectionately entreating them, in some way corresponding to their social influence and elevated religious views, to bear their testimony against Slavery, and to use their utmost efforts for its speedy abolition."

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, with a request that they will take such measures for carrying it out as may in their judgment be most efficient."

Resolved, "That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the 'British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,' with the sincere thanks of this meeting for the timely and valuable address to Christians of all denominations, a document eminently calculated to aid and encourage American Abolitionists in their arduous and unremitting labours, and which it is hoped will, under the Divine blessing, be instrumental in arousing the Christian community to a sense of its duty to the oppressed slave."

Mr. Estlin said, it would be seen that the resolution referred to the portion of the report that noticed the address of the "British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society" to Christian churches. He observed that a year ago he should have felt it requisite, on such an occasion, to have made some statements explanatory of the nature of American Slavery, but "Uncle Tom's Cabin" has rendered that unnecessary; it had instructed Englishmen that, to force men contrary to their will to the performance of oppressive labours all their lives, and to rob them every day of their daily earnings, was not exactly carrying out the Christian rule of "doing to others as we would that they should do to us," notwithstanding the exhortations of American clergymen to the contrary: and England's heart was at length compelled to feel sympathy with those who had to see an aged mother, a beloved sister, a beautiful daughter, separated from their dearest ties by men boasting of their Christianity and liberty, placed on the auction-block, and sold to the highest bidder. As the "British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society" had paid the Unitarians a compliment, not always bestowed on them by their orthodox brethren, in considering them as a portion of the *Christian* church, he would proceed to show what were the relations of the Unitarians of America with the Slavery question. Compared with other religious sects in the United States, the Unitarians were few. The Baptists, for instance, had 8,000 ministers, and about a million church members. Unitarians had 244 societies, of which 235 were in the eight free States and only 9 in the slave States. The number of ministers in the body was 207, of whom 200 were in the free States. Church members were variously estimated, from 15,000 to 30,000, probably the real number was between these extremes. With the holding of slaves, Unitarians could have but little connection, but the guilt of maintaining Slavery did not rest solely with those who claimed ownership in human beings. Among the Unitarians of the United States, there stood forth some noble examples of independent spirit and Christian conduct. Channing's writings against Slavery were known to all. The eminent and amiable Follen sacrificed all his worldly prospects to his fidelity to the cause of humanity. Dr. Henry Ware took up the cause to some extent. The Rev. Samuel J. May, whose interesting conversation with Dr. Channing on Slavery forms one of the most touching anecdotes in the "Memoirs" published by the Rev. W. H. Channing, is still labouring in the great cause. And there are, also, the Rev. Dr. Furness, of Philadelphia, Dr. Willard, John Pierpont, Theodore Parker, Samuel May, junior, W. H. Channing, James F. Clark, Higginson, Wallcutt, and perhaps half a dozen more, who have boldly taken the part of the slave. All these have suffered for the cause; either by the injury of their worldly circumstances, or of their social position, or by the estrangement of friends; and with these exceptions the great mass of Unitarian ministers have been silent on the slaves' wrongs, while some have spoke in favour of his oppressor. The Rev. Theodore Clapp, of New Orleans, has been quoted by Mrs. Stowe, in her "Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin," as a pro-slavery divine. Mr. E. read the paragraph at page 65, and also some extracts from a Sermon by the same Minister, in which he says, "the venerable patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were all slaveholders"—"the same God who gave Abraham sunshine, air, rain, flocks, herds, silver and gold, blessed him also with a donation of slaves." "Here we see God dealing in slaves, giving them to his own favourite child—a man of superlative worth—and as a reward for his eminent goodness!" Dr. Dewey's revolting declaration in reference to the Fugitive Slave Law was universally known. Dr. Gannett, of Boston, had, in a printed sermon, recommended the return of the fugitive slave to his master. The Rev. Mr. Allen, formerly of Washington, now of Bangor, Maine, had printed a sermon in praise of the Union, urging for its maintenance obedience to the Fugitive Slave Law. As a religious body, the American Unitarians had never given any help to the Anti-Slavery cause; on the contrary, they had obstructed it. Any effort to have a recognition of the sin of slaveholding, and of the duty of taking some measures for its removal introduced into the annual conventions or meetings of "American Unitarian Associations" have been successfully resisted. The *Christian Register*, the organ of the body, may fairly be classed with pro-slavery papers. The New York Correspondent of the London *Times* complimented it as being an honourable exception to the religious journals of the free States, in consequence of its having counselled obedience to the Fugitive Slave Law! In the two last numbers, evidence of its hostility to the Anti-Slavery cause, and of its unfairness, is afforded by the republication at full length of a letter from the Rev. Edmund Squire of S. Boston, which appeared in the *Inquirer* of March 5th, in defence of the "Mission of Silence" on the Slavery question, as advocated and practised by the American Unitarians, while Mr. Bishop's able reply, in the *Inquirer* of March 19, is entirely suppressed. This apathy of our brethren in the United States was injurious to the Abolition movement, and discreditable to them as professed Christians, and it acted as a poison upon nearly all who came within its influence. Our laymen go to America, and return; telling us that Slavery is by no means so bad as it is represented; that the negroes are utterly unfit for freedom; that emancipation would derange the commercial and political institutions of that country. Our ministers visit their transatlantic brethren, and assure us that there is much comfort among the slaves; that the Abolitionists are occasioning mischief; that the Unitarian Ministers are doing all that they consider necessary to put an end to Slavery, and that we, unable to judge of their difficulties, must not judge their conduct. The last homily preached in this strain to British Unitarians, was in the letter just referred to, written by Mr. Squire to the *Inquirer*; he there refers to the Abolitionists, those noble men and women who have convulsed the Union by their untiring efforts—as being "the worst foes to the slave," and as having "re-fastened his chains with tenfold tightness" when just falling off, and then advises that no *direct aggression* should be made on Slavery, but that it should be left for "Christianity" to be its victor! Mrs. Stowe has, however, dispelled some of these delusions; the Unitarian Abolitionists declare to us that we are as competent to appreciate the difficulties of their brethren as they are. Mr. E. was informed by Mr. Bishop that, when in America, he uniformly inquired what were those difficulties which could not be understood in this country, but was never able to learn a single circumstance with which he was not previously acquainted! Mr. E. spoke of Mr. Bishop as having done great honour to the British Unitarians by his protest against Slavery, in the Baltimore Unitarian Convention, a testimony on the part of an English minister travelling in America, almost without example. Mr. Estlin trusted the resolutions he had to propose would be passed, and that they might be sent by a delegate to the Committee of the "British and Foreign Unitarian Association." He hoped that body would not again reject the appeal made to them, as they did two years ago, upon the ground that the consideration of such a subject would be foreign to the rules of the association. Mr. Estlin acknowledged himself to be one of those intolerant persons so censured at that time for wishing to exclude from our pulpits American ministers who had abetted, or been silent upon, the iniquity of Slavery. He did not presume to judge how far, in the sight of God they were blamable, as we could not estimate the strength of their temptation, or know how we should act if placed in their circumstances; but he did not understand that charity which forbade the exercise of our moral perceptions, and required us to surrender our power of discriminating between right and wrong; and he was so constituted, that religious services conducted by such ministers as Dr. Dewey or the Rev. Theodore Clapp, would not awaken or cherish any devotional sentiment in his heart. After an address of some length, and expressing the hope of having been able to show that the "Union" had good grounds for complying with the request of the "British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society," Mr. Estlin concluded by saying, "our Unitarian brethren in the United States may not have taken any direct part in persecuting their coloured countrymen, but the clothes of the persecutors had been laid at their feet; their own garments may not have been dyed in the blood of the slave, but they have stood so near, and so idly, by the altar of avarice, of impurity, and of power, on which he has been sacrificed, that they have not escaped being *sprinkled* with his blood; we call upon them as brothers descended from the same stock with ourselves, as speakers of the same language, readers of the same Bible, as Christians, as Unitarians, to go, to wash, and be clean."

The Rev. S. A. Steinthal, in seconding the resolution, said, I feel great diffidence in following a gentleman who, like Mr. Estlin, has devoted a life to the study of the intricate question of Slavery. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for what he has done in this subject; but I confess he has caused me some very painful feelings by the remarks he has just made. I did know that Unitarians in America had taken up what appears to me to be an unworthy position in respect to Slavery, but I was not aware how deeply stained our religious body was with this sin. We have heard how much Unitarianism conduces to freedom, how civil and religious liberty is its standing motto; even at our dinner to-day that toast was most warmly received, but here we find that Unitarianism has not shrunk from supporting the foul sin of Slavery. We have been told of horrors connected with Slavery; I believe they are inseparable from it; but this is not a question of horrors; it matters not whether fathers have been torn from their children, whether husbands have been separated from wives, or daughters sold to shame; these things do occur, but this is not the question for us; we have to do with the great principle that Slavery is a sin; that no man has a right to hold a fellow man in bondage for one hour; this is the principle of the question, and on this I am ready to take my stand and meet any slaveholder or slave apologist. Sir, the question is simple indeed; but when we find that Unitarians are guilty of upholding a system by which this right is given to men, is it not time for us to step forward and try to arrest their course! Are we not deeply interested in the matter, if we love pure Christianity, if we love our pure faith? I do therefore most sincerely trust that, at the approaching meeting of the Association, a most decided stand will be taken on the subject of Slavery. The Association is founded for the promotion of Unitarianism, because Unitarianism leads, we believe, to moral excellence in men, not merely for the love of a name, and surely a practical means of proving the true Christian spirit of Unitarianism must come within its scope. If it does not, I must say it is time there were a change in its constitution, and I, for one, shall be ready to promote it: I trust, however, no such step will be necessary: but that the sole organized representative that English Unitarians have will prove that we, as a body, will not countenance so hideous an iniquity.

The Chairman, Rev. R. B. Aspland, in putting the resolution, said that had it contained anything like a pledge to exclude from our fellowship those of our American brethren who might not accord with us on the subject of Slavery, he for one must have protested against it, even though he had stood alone in this course. But he saw no reason why they should not unite in such a resolution as that which was before the meeting. His hope had certainly been, at one time, that the Christian principle and feeling of America would have put down Slavery. But recent legislation in the United States, and the manner in which the Fugitive Slave Law had been enforced, had convinced him that the churches there had not taken that noble stand for freedom which could have been desired; and he feared there was too much reason for thinking that they were indirectly sustaining Slavery, even when they did not openly give it their sanction and support.